

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

RICHARD WILLIAM WARD,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-cr-00306-LDG-NJK

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE MOTION TO  
RECONSIDER

(Docket No. 83)

Pending before the Court is the Government's motion for the Court to reconsider its order at Docket No. 78. *See* Docket No. 83. The Government's motion fails to address the standards for reconsideration, however. *Cf. Kabo Tools v. Porauto Indus. Co., Ltd.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 156928, \*6 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (outlining basic standards in moving for reconsideration). As such, the pending motion is DENIED without prejudice.

Moreover, the Court is somewhat confused as to the basis for the filing of the pending motion. The motion as presently written appears to simply rehash the arguments already raised. From the Government's statements at the last hearing, the Court believed that any such motion would address: (1) whether this Court has the authority to compel an *in camera* production of documents in the possession of Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department<sup>1</sup> and, (2) if it does not have that authority, how

---

<sup>1</sup> By contrast, the pending motion is focused on the Government's duty to review and produce such documents.

1 the Court should determine the credibility of Detective Kitchen's testimony in light of the record as it  
2 currently stands. Those issues were not addressed in the pending motion.

3 Any renewed motion shall be filed no later than March 30, 2015. Any response in opposition  
4 shall be filed no later than April 6, 2015. Any reply shall be filed no later than April 9, 2015.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: March 23, 2015

7  
8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 NANCY J. KOPPE  
11 United States Magistrate Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28